

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated May 2, 2007. Claims 1-18 have been canceled. Claims 19-34 were previously withdrawn. Claims 35-52 have been added. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

#### Claim Objections

Claims 6, 12, and 18 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of the claim from which they depend. Claims 3-6, 9-12, and 15-18 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant has canceled claims 1-18; therefore, the objections to these claims are moot.

#### Section 112 Rejections

Claims 2, 4, 8, 10, 14, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1, 7, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1, 7, and 13 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly lacking antecedent basis. Claims 1, 7, and 13 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly omitting essential elements or steps. Applicant has canceled claims 1-18; therefore, the objections to these claims are moot.

#### Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,967 to Frid et al. ("Frid"). To render a claim obvious under Section 103, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143. Applicant has canceled claims 1-18 and added new claims 35-52. Applicant submits that *Frid* fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations in new independent claims 35, 43, and 48.

*Frid* discloses a healthcare device that generates medical information, packages it in HTML format, and makes it available over a communication network such as the Internet. See

col. 2, lines 13-36. It is unclear how the disclosed healthcare device in *Frid* relates to the claimed invention. *Frid* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least generating an encrypted code corresponding to a first code, sending the encrypted code to a computer, receiving the same encrypted code representing a user selection back from the computer, and generating a different encrypted code corresponding to the first code, as claimed. Furthermore, *Frid* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest sending a first set of encrypted codes to a computer and receiving back some of the encrypted codes representing a user selection as claimed. There is nothing in *Frid* that teaches or suggests that any information sent is *ever* received back. There is nothing in *Frid* that teaches or suggests user selections of any kind, and certainly not user selections corresponding to received encrypted codes. In addition, there is nothing in *Frid* that teaches or suggests generating different encrypted codes that correspond to the same unencrypted code. *Frid* only briefly mentions encryption at col. 5, line 41, and only in the context of providing secure access to *provided* information. Nowhere does *Frid* teach or suggest generating encrypted codes that are sent *and received back*.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that independent claims 35, 43, and 48 are not obvious in view of *Frid*. Because claims 36-42, 44-47, and 49-52 depend from and further limit these independent claims, Applicant submits that pending claims 35-52 are patentable over *Frid*.

Applicant : Mark Gerber, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/694,102  
Filed : October 27, 2003  
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney Docket No.: 16477-003002

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fees are believed due at this time. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 2, 2007

/Penny L. Lowry/

Penny L. Lowry  
Reg. No. 57,186

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1717 Main Street  
Suite 5000  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 760-6137  
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091